

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	CASE NO. 5:19-cr-741
	)	
	)	
PLAINTIFF,	)	CHIEF JUDGE SARA LIOI
	)	
vs.	)	
	)	MEMORANDUM OPINION
	)	AND ORDER
MICHAEL HAKIM MORALE,	)	
	)	
	)	
DEFENDANT.	)	

On March 12, 2025, the Court received correspondence from defendant Michael Hakim Morale (“Morale”) seeking clarification of the Court’s Order on Violation of Conditions of Supervised Release. (Doc. No. 63 (Correspondence); *see* Doc. No. 60 (Order on Violation).) The Court construes the correspondence as a motion for clarification, pursuant to Fed. R. Crim. P. 36, and denies the same.

On October 18, 2021, the Court sentenced Morale to a custody term of 59 months, following his guilty plea to being a felon in possession of a firearm and ammunition, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 922(g)(1) and 924(a)(2). (Doc. No. 46 (Judgment); Minutes of Proceedings [non-document], 10/18/2021; Doc. No. 41 (Plea Agreement); Minutes of Proceedings [non-document], 6/3/2021; *see also* Doc. No. 1 (Indictment).) On December 3, 2024, the Court revoked Morale’s supervised release and sentenced him to a custody term of 10 months, with credit for time served, upon its determination that Morale had violated two terms of his supervision. (Doc. No. 60, at 2; Minutes of Proceedings [non-document], 12/3/2024; Doc. No. 51 (Violation Report); Minutes of

Proceedings [non-document], 11/18/2024; Doc. No. 59 (R&R).) Relevant to the present motion, the Order on Violation also provided:

Following defendant's custody term, the defendant will be on supervised release for a period of 2 years with the same terms and conditions as previously ordered by the Court, with the following additional condition: the defendant is to serve up to 6 months of his term in a Residential Reentry Center (RRC).

(Doc. No. 60, at 2.)

In the present motion, Morale claims that the Case Manager at his facility has refused to consider him for placement in an RRC for the last six months of his custody term. (Doc. No. 63, at 1; *see* Doc. No. 63-1 (Request for Administrative Remedy).) According to Morale, his Case Manager has misinterpreted the Court's Order on Violation as recommending RRC placement for up to six months of his supervised release term. (*Id.*)

It is Morale who is mistaken. As the plain language of the Order on Violation states, the additional condition of RRC placement applies to Morale's supervised release term and not his custody term.

Because the Court's Order requires no clarification, Morale's motion (Doc. No. 63) is denied.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: March 26, 2025

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**HONORABLE SARA LIOI**  
**CHIEF JUDGE**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**